

App. No. 10/099,775
Attorney Docket 3206.2.1 NP

Remarks

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Written Office Action. Further, the Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephonic conference held on 26 January 2006, wherein Mikulas and the Claims of the present application were discussed as well as the objection to the Drawings.

During the telephonic conference, the following language was agreed upon for use in Claim 1, "wherein first node A, second node B, and third node C form a base plane and the fourth strut does not lie in the base plane" and that such would result in a withdrawal of the present rejection of the claims under Mikulas. Further, it was agreed that should the specification be amended in the description for Figure 1 to include appropriate references to A, B, and C, the objection to the Drawings would be withdrawn. The Applicant further thanks the Examiner for noting that upon appropriate amendment as discussed, the finality of the Written Office Action would be withdrawn if additional art is presented in a further Written Office Action.

Drawings

With respect to the objection to the Drawings for failing to include the reference numerals "A", "B", and "C", Applicant has amended the specification to include the references "A," "B," and "C."

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claim 1 has been amended as discussed in the telephonic interview with the Examiner to include language more clearly not taught by Mikulas. Accordingly, wherein


App. No. 10/099,775
Attorney Docket 3206.2.1 NP

all the claims of the present application depend, directly or indirectly, from Claim 1 and wherein Claim 1 includes limitations not taught nor suggested by the prior art, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1 – 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Conclusion

For these reasons, it is believed that none of the prior art teaches the claimed invention. Furthermore, it is believed that the foregoing amendment has adequate support in the specification, and accordingly there should be no new matter. Applicant believes the pending claims have addressed each of the issues pointed out by the Examiner in the Office Action. In light of the foregoing amendment, the claims should be in a condition for allowance. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the proposed changes, Applicant again invites the Examiner to do so by telephone conference.

Respectfully Submitted,


Michael W. Starkweather
Registration No. 34,441
Attorney for Applicant

Date: 1/30/06

Michael W. Starkweather
Starkweather and Associates
9035 South 1300 East
Suite 200
Sandy, Utah 84094
Telephone: 801/272-8368